

REMARKS

This is in response to the Office Action dated April 18, 2006. In view of the foregoing amendments and following representations, reconsideration is respectfully requested.

By the above amendment, claims 1-20 have been cancelled and replaced with new claims 21-38. Thus, claims 21-38 are currently pending in the present application.

To facilitate the Examiner's reconsideration of the application, the specification and abstract have been reviewed and revised in order to make a number of minor clarifying and other editorial amendments. Due to the nature of the revision involved, a substitute specification and abstract has been prepared. No new matter has been added. Also enclosed is a "marked-up" copy of the original specification and abstract to show the changes that have been incorporated into the substitute specification and abstract. The enclosed copy is entitled "Version with Markings to Show Changes Made."

Next, on pages 2-7 of the Office Action, the original claims are rejected over the prior art, with the Examiner primarily relying on Silzer (U.S. Pub. No. 2004/0001022). It is submitted that the present invention, as embodied by the new claims, now clearly distinguishes over the applied references for the following reasons.

The present invention, as defined in new independent claim 21, includes a projection portion that projects from an end surface of said housing so as to be inclined away from a first surface of said housing which is different from the end surface of said housing (see Fig. 17B). Thus, even if the housing is placed on a flat metal surface, the

claimed arrangement leads to a decrease in electromagnetic coupling between the antenna element contained in the projection portion and the flat metal surface so as to suppress deterioration in the antenna gain.

Claim 22 recites that a second surface of the housing is substantially spaced from a flat surface when the housing is arranged on the flat surface (see Fig. 18). This arrangement prevents possible damage to a surface of the housing.

Silzer discloses a PDA apparatus including an attached handle 50 and an inset antenna 52. It is not clear the antenna is contained in the handle in any of the Silzer embodiments. However, Silzer clearly does not disclose or suggest an inclined projection portion as required in claim 21. Thus, the Silzer apparatus does not realize the advantages of the claimed invention as described on page 37, line19 to page 38, line19 of the present specification as originally filed.

Furthermore, the Busch and Shoji references do not disclose any type of corresponding projection portion. Accordingly, it is submitted that the present invention, as defined in independent claim 21, is clearly allowable over the Silzer, Busch and Shoji references taken alone or in combination.


Note that claims 22-38 depend directly or indirectly from claim 21, and are therefore allowable at least by virtue of their dependencies.

In view of the above, it is submitted that the present application is now clearly in condition for allowance. The Examiner therefore is requested to pass this case to issue.

In the event that the Examiner has any comments or suggestions of a nature necessary to place this case in condition for allowance, then the Examiner is requested to contact Applicant's undersigned attorney by telephone to promptly resolve any remaining matters.

Respectfully submitted,

Hiroshi IWAI et al.

By: 
Michael S. Huppert
Registration No. 40,268
Attorney for Applicants

MSH/kjf
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
July 18, 2006